UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,712	04/30/2001	Kursat Uvez	05306.P027	4919

7590 07/28/2004

EXAMINER
BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	10

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Glenn Von Tersch
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/846,712	UVEZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 10-12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by STONE (US 6,101,510).

As to claim 10, STONE teaches a server (server program of an initial web browser control / initial web browser control) comprising: means for receiving a request (method request / Navigate request having a URL identifier or frame ID) identifying an object (HTML document / rendered HTML viewer object that represents the HTML document) associated with a network based application (subsequent web browser control) from a third party application (client application) (col. 4, lines 2-5; col. 4, lines 25-28); calling the network based application (subsequent web browser control) in response to the request (based on a determination that the frame name corresponds to a different browser control) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); means for dynamically accessing the object from a network based application (web browser control) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38;

col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); and means for transmitting the datum (web page) to the third party application (create the web page and return it in the frame created by the application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14).

As to claim 11, STONE teaches the server (initial web browser control / server program of initial web browser control), the network based application (subsequent web browser control) and the third party application (client application) are installed on a personal computer (computer system for navigating to a web site) (col. 4, lines 51-54; col. 2, line 66 – col. 4, line 32).

As to claim 12, STONE teaches the network-based application (initial web browser control) includes a World Wide Web site (via the Navigate request) (col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 23-43).

As to claim 14, STONE teaches cited teachings as disclosed above and that the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). STONE also teaches the web browser control acts as an OLE container (col. 10, lines 34-40). Hence, the browser control is allowed to be an OLE container to another browser control. Therefore, it is inherent in the teachings of STONE that the browser control is a client application to another browser control.

As to claim 16, STONE teaches the server (initial web browser control / server program of initial web browser control) includes a programmatic interface (implementation of the member functions) to communicate with the object (hypertext viewer object containing web page) (col. 8, lines 10-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 13, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over STONE (US Patent 6,101,510) in view of "Understanding ActiveX and OLE" by CHAPPELL.

As to claim 1, STONE teaches a computing system (col. 4, lines 51-54) comprising: a network based application (subsequent web browser control) associated with an object (HTML document / rendered HTML viewer object that represents the HTML document); and a server (server program of an initial web browser control / initial web browser control) to receive a request identifying the object (method request / Navigate request containing URL identifier of document or frame identifier) from an application (client application) (col. 4, lines 2-5; col. 4, lines 25-28); to call the network based application (subsequent web browser control) in response to the request (based

on a determination that the frame name corresponds to a different browser control) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14), to dynamically access the object associated with the network-based application and to transfer a datum (web page) of the object to the application (create the web page and return it in the frame created by the application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 2, STONE teaches the computing system includes a personal computer (computer system for navigating to a web site) (col. 4, lines 51-54; col. 2, line 66 – col. 4, line 32).

As to claim 3, STONE teaches the server and the network based applications are installed on the personal computer (col. 4, lines 51-54).

As to claim 4, STONE teaches the object (HTML document / rendered HTML viewer object that represents the HTML document) includes the datum (web page) and a method to manipulate the datum (rendering and displaying the web page) (col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 5, STONE teaches the server (server program of an initial web browser control / initial web browser control) is to access the object to retrieve the datum (web page) (col. 8, lines 40-48; col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 6, STONE teaches the server (server program of an initial web browser control / initial web browser control) is to transmit the received datum (web page) to the application (client application) (via displaying the application in the frame created by the client) (col. 9, lines 37-58). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and

embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 7, STONE teaches a computer-implemented method for a server (initial browser control / server program of initial browser control), comprising: receiving a request (method request / Navigate request containing a URL identifier or frame identifier) identifying to an object (document) associated with a network based application (subsequent web browser control) (col. 10, lines 15-40) from an application (client application); calling the network based application in response to the request (based on a determination that the frame name corresponds to a different browser control); dynamically accessing the object associated with the network based application (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); and transferring a datum (web page) of the object to the application (create the web page and return it in the frame created by the application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the

teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 8, STONE teaches the object (HTML document / rendered HTML viewer object that represents the HTML document) includes the datum (web page) and a method to manipulate the datum (rendering and displaying the web page) (col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 9, STONE teaches the server (initial browser control / server program of initial browser control) is to retrieve and transmit the datum (web page) to the application (client application) (via displaying the application in the frame created by the client) (col. 9, lines 37-58). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 13, STONE teaches cited teachings as disclosed above and that the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the third party container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claims 17-19, reference is made to a machine readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 7-9 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 7-9 above.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over STONE (US Patent 6,101,510) in view of "ActiveX Programming Unleashed" by CHEN, Weiying.

As to claim 15, STONE teaches the network based application (subsequent browser control / container) includes a script (script / scripting language added by the application) (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 23, lines 47-58). However, STONE does not teach that the script or scripting language is JavaScript.

CHEN a network based application (web browser control) (pg. 3, 1st 5th – 7th paragraphs) containing any Document Objects and that Java Script document objects

embodies properties of a web page (pgs. 14 and 17-18). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that since the browser control contains any document objects and that JavaScript is a form of a document object that the browser control contains JavaScript document objects. Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHEN in order to render / load HTML pages into a browser (pg. 14).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 6/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Stone does not teach or suggest at least having a server that receives a request identifying an object associated with a network-based application from a non-network based application, calls the network based application in response to the request, dynamically accesses the object associated with the network-based application, and then transfers a datum of the object to the non-network based application, as does the presently claimed invention. The examiner disagrees. Stone teaches limitations wherein a web browser control invokes another web browser control to handle the processing of the request (col. 23, lines 28-35; col. 4, lines 16-22). This is achieved by the web browser control having a server program that determines whether to invoke the navigate method on the current instance of the browser control or send the method to another browser control based on the target frame name (col. 24, lines 22-48; col. 16, lines 1-27). Therefore, it is obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that the server program of one web browser control is the server and that a

subsequent web browser control is the network based application wherein the initial browser control receives a request identifying the object (document specifying a URL with a frame identifier) from the non-network based application (application) to call the network based application (another browser control) in response to the request (determination that the frame is associated with this browser control) to dynamically access the object (document) associated with the network based application (browser control) and to transfer a datum (document / event / information) of the object to the non-network based application (application program) (by rendering the web page in a frame created by the application program). Therefore, Stone adequately teach the limitations as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 21, 2004

LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER